



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,137	09/18/2006	Wataru Ikeda	P36312-02	6947
42212	7590	12/17/2009	EXAMINER	
PANASONIC PATENT CENTER 1130 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW, SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				DAZENSKI, MARC A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kamata.kenji@jp.panasonic.com  
ppc@us.panasonic.com  
odedrad@us.panasonic.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/573,137	IKEDA ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
MARC DAZENSKI	2621	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Final

(1) MARC DAZENSKI.

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Kerry Culpepper.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 2 December 2009

**Time:** 11am

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic
- Video Conference
- Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*101 rejection to claim 6.*

Claims discussed:

*Claim 6.*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Tsumagari (US PgPub 2003/0161615)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Informed applicant that claim 6 would be allowable if "non-transistorY" were added before "computer readable medium" in the preamble of claim 6, and if he agreed that the claimed "computer readable medium" was in fact "instruction ROM (24)" in figure 16, as well as lines 25-26 of page 30. Applicant declined and instead expressed desire to pursue a proposed amendment to claim 6 that would change it from a program claim to a method claim. I informed the applicant that the proposed claim amendment as presented would be rejected under 101 as not being tied to any particular machine. Applicant then agreed to an Examiner Initiated Interview at a future date no later than 7 December 2009 in order to discuss possible claim amendments that would circumvent the 101 rejection to the proposed amendment and therefore put the case in condition for allowance.*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/MARC DAZENSKI/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)